E
286
.B74
1838

74

38

E 286
B74
1838
Copy 1

REVIEW

OF THE

REV. HUBBARD WINSLOW'S ORATION,

Delivered on the 4th of July, 1838,

BEFORE THE BOSTON CITY GOVERNMENT.

The City of Boston has long been in the practice of celebrating the Anniversary of our National Independence by a procession and a public oration, under the direction of the Municipal Officers. For some years past, these celebrations have assumed a mere partizan character, and have been made the occasions of bringing forward some aspiring strippling to abuse our republican institutions—to vilify the rulers of the people's choice, and to demonstrate, by bold and impassioned invective, the incapacity of the people for self-government, and then to print these green and acrid effusions at the public charge. On the late anniversary, the City Authorities made their celebration a regular wassail at Faneuil Hall, where the political partizan, including the reverend orator, caroused; and many gulphed down their anti-democratic toasts in well *laced* Madeira, (the temperance cause interposing no obstacle,) making the poor democrats pay for heating the poker. This, however, is not only sanctioned by their principles and their interest, but is fortified by what to them is of binding force, the law of English precedent. In London, whose aristocracy our city nabobs wish to imitate—in London, where the tories hold, as the tories hold here, that the people are good beasts of burden, the Judges dine once or more a-year at the public charge, in the Mansion House, which place "is then made the arena to exhibit some *new idol* to the worship of tory disciples."

But to Mr Winslow's oration. It is a singular compound of extracts from Edmund Burke, the English tory, and from Daniel Webster, the American, of the slang of the partizan press of federalism, illuminated, occasionally, by coruscations from the mind of the Bowdoin street divine himself. It is somewhat annoying to be compelled to pay for re-publishing the tory sentiments and vile slanders of Burke, against democratic principles, and more especially as hashed over and chopped up by Mr Winslow; but on the whole, we think it the best, perhaps, the orator could do, and surely he must not be blamed for the publication. Our wise city government must own that paternity, and to them, we hope, all the benefit of this partizan carousal, at the public charge, may enure.

This gentleman, it seems, could no more write an oration, than he could preach a sermon, without a text, and here we have Mr Winslow's text or peg on which his oration is to hang, viz:

"The means of the perpetuity and prosperity of our republic." And the first loop he makes to connect the peg and the essay, is this:—"Fellow-citizens: The *sentiment* at the foundation of the remarks which I propose to offer, *has long been firmly established in the minds of all whom I have the honor to address.*"

We are quite unable to perceive the affinity that joins the text and the comment. There is another difficulty, also, on which we have unfortunately stumbled; if "the sentiment at the foundation of his remarks," and which he proposed to dwell upon in his discourse, had "*long been established* in the minds of *all* whom he had the honor to address," it would seem to have been an act of supererogation to tire his audience with his discourse.

When the frog attempted, by swelling, to reach the size of the ox, he burst—when Wise's balloon became too much rarified, it exploded; and Mr Winslow has met a somewhat similar fate, in the following grandiloquent sentence, to be found in the 8th page of his oration:—

"Cast your eyes abroad over the length and the breadth of this great territory, bounded only by the *shoreless ocean* on either side, and by the torrid and the frigid zones on either extremity: contemplate its *almost* boundless plains and vallies of richest virgin soil; behold its thousands of verdant hills and mountains, swelling *upwards towards the skies*," &c.

To bound a coast or country by "a shoreless ocean," would sound better from the mouth of *Saint Patrick* than from Mr Winslow's. We should like to

E 286
.B74
1838

have Mr Winslow inform us, in what direction hills swell, except "towards the skies," if they swell "upward?"

Perhaps genius and dulness, poetry and insipidity, cannot be shown in stronger contrast, than by placing Mr Forrest's illustration of this idea, the vastness of our territory, by the side of Mr Winslow's. Mr Forrest, in his oration, speaking of the extent of the republic, says—

"From its borders, kissed by the waves of the Atlantic, to

> The continuous woods,
> Where rolls the Oregon, and hears no sound,
> Save his own dashing;

from the inland oceans of the north, to the sparkling surface of the tropical sea, rippled by breezes laden with the perfumes of eternal summers, our vast theatre of national achievement extends. What a course here for the grand race of democratic liberty!"

Mr Winslow, however, has not made a greater *bull* than Edmund Burke made in his speech on the trial of Warren Hastings, which Mr Winslow quotes as an exquisite specimen of the sublime, which the city government print, and for which we poor democrats are compelled to pay.

Burke says—"My Lords: when the devouring flames shall have destroyed this perishable globe, and it sinks into the abyss of nature, from whence," &c.

Here, the perishable globe is first destroyed by the devouring flames, and then when there is nothing left of it, that nothing sinks into the abyss of nature. And pray, where is the abyss of nature into which this destroyed, devoured, burnt-up world, this nothing sinks?

Such is the choice specimen of Burke's eloquence, selected by Mr Winslow, printed by order of the city authorities, and paid for from the public purse! Surely Boston can now preëminently claim to be the *Athens* of America.

We are not disposed, however, to pursue a course of hyper-criticism. We have adverted to these literary blunders, to show that even in those things on which a college-bred man often most prides himself, Mr Winslow is loose and faulty. His place, even here, ought rather to be that of a pupil than teacher.

The great features which mark the principles of the whole tory race, are discernable throughout the oration, viz: a distrust of the capacity of the people for self-government—an over-weening egotism, that makes his notion of things the only standard of right—an intolerance of all freedom of thought—an incapacity to perceive clearly the truth, and an apparent dislike to regard it—add to these a profound reverence for the opinions of distinguished absolutists, and we have a synopsis of his discourse.

Speaking of our country, Mr Winslow says—

"Think of the hundreds of millions of people which it is capable of sustaining, and which it promises to sustain at no distant day; observe its rapid increase of population, wealth, luxuries—all those causes which tend to enervate the mind, nourish selfish and indomitable passions, and annihilate that severe, masculine morality, essential to civil and religious freedom—and it *cannot fail to appear*, that the great experiment is but begun, and that its final result, to human view, is *quite problematical*."

Is his conclusion a fair deduction from his premises? Does an increase of population, of wealth and luxuries, tend to enervate that masculine virtue, which is essential to civil and religious freedom? We have always thought the reverse—we have thought and history confirms our views, that civil and religious liberty tended to invigorate the mind, to fortify morality, to increase population, and to enable that population to provide itself, through the means of honestly acquired wealth, with the conveniences and the luxuries of life.

Our population has increased, our wealth and luxuries have increased—but our population is not more selfish than their fathers, and they have as much morality, aye, "masculine morality," as their ancestors. What do we toil for—what does Mr Winslow preach for, but to obtain wealth, with which to buy luxuries, in other words, comforts and pleasures? Wealth and luxury and population will never destroy our system—injustice and intolerance may do it, but these can never permanently and extensively prevail, where a FREE press exists.

Mr Winslow says—"Those who formed our government prized civil liberty, because it afforded them an *opportunity* to serve God according to the dictates of their consciences; while they believed the *actual service* of God was an *essential means of sustaining civil liberty.*"

Our ancestors prized civil liberty, because it afforded them an opportunity of serving *themselves;* and we prize it, because it affords every one the opportunity of serving himself, while it deprives him of the right of harming his fellow.

We are at a loss to divine Mr Winslow's meaning, that our ancestors "believed that the *actual service of God required*," &c. Does he intend to say that a union of Church and State is an essential means of preserving civil liberty? We suppose such to be his meaning, for he follows up the idea by the remark, that our ancestors "began [their government] with prayer and praises; they acknowledged God in all their ways, inscribing his hallowed name upon all their social, secular, and *public transactions.* * *

"They held firmly to the Sacred Scriptures as an infallible utterance of the divine mind for our standard of moral truth and duty. * *

"They believed that we are a sinful race, needing that dispensation of recuperative grace unfolded in the gospel; and that only the penitent and obedient will enjoy the everlasting blessings of the divine favor. Such were their religious views, and upon these they acted. They lived in the world *in view of living forever*, under a government of righteous retribution. * *

"To this, more than to any other human cause, are we indebted for the civil and religious liberty we this day enjoy. * *

"The same foundation [that is, the religion of our fathers?] upon which the pillars of this republic were reared, must continue to sustain them, or it will soon be numbered with those of other ages. * * Before the celebration of another year, the tempestuous elements of unrestrained human passion would rise above control—the sun of this nation would be turned to darkness, and its *moon to blood;* [who is *its* moon?] its *stars* would fall from heaven, *as* when a *fig-tree* casteth her untimely *figs*, and the sanguinary history of *atheistical France would be repeated.*

"But the permanent existence of general atheism is *never* to be anticipated. Its action is spasmodic and *temporary.* [Then why so much outcry about it?] Religious sentiments are a part of our nature. * *

"The question with us, then, is not whether the *people of this nation* shall have a pure religion or none; for, a religion of some kind they will certainly

have. The only question is, whether they shall have religion pure or corrupted. [In other words, whether the government shall establish one, pure, according to Mr Winslow's standard, or whether people shall be left, as they are now, free to profess and follow what they believe.] * *

"Adversaries of human accountability to God are therefore enemies to our republic. [Very charitable! extreme mark of humility!] It is not because they [i. e. those who do not believe in future rewards and punishments] exercise freedom of conscience, but because they outrage *all* conscience, not because they *use* the rights of men, but because they *abuse* the rights of men; alienate themselves from humanity, and become as irresponsible *brute beasts*, that they *forfeit all claims* to the privileges of a free government. * *

"Every enlighted and faithful patriot will therefore give his influence to hold the great principles of moral accountability in contact with every mind. Let them [let who?] be commissioned as set forth and sanctioned in the sacred Scriptures, to enlighten the understandings, invigorate the intellects, elevate the aims, inspire the hearts and CONTROL the WILLS of both *subject* and *magistrate*."

What a specimen of bombast and froth—of sacerdotal egotism, intolerance, impudence and ignorance. What stuff to be paid for from the public purse!

If there be any one moral attribute more valuable than another, it is TRUTH. Unless our assumptions, our arguments, and our information, which guide our actions, are founded in truth, we can arrive at a just result only by accident. God, we suppose to be all truth and benevolence, and the nearer we approach them, the more we resemble Him. There is evidently a desire on the part of the young and fashionable clergy, to establish a religion of State, as the only sure basis on which to rest our civil institutions; and as the only sure means, also, of securing to themselves a certainty of rioting, permanently, in wealth and luxuries. Hence, these efforts to cry up their own belief, and their shameless abuse of all who do not think as they think.

Christianity, as taught by the Saviour, is a lovely code of moral truths—it was the democracy and the radicalism of his day—it was tolerant and charitable—meek and humble—assauging misery—rebuking pride and insolence—succouring the needy—shielding the oppressed. How changed! It rests now, in many instances, as we find it *practically*, on the frail props of error, intolerance, pride, cruelty, and mendicity. It is for "making the kingdoms of this world the kingdoms of Christ." It raises costly churches—it decorates them with vain and expensive trappings. Its consecrated vessels must be of embossed silver, often inlaid with gold. The truths of Holy Writ must be made more lovely by the gilded dross of the earth upon the binding. It vaunteth itself. This is practical, modern Christianity—not that pure and holy religion taught by the SON OF PURITY himself, some eighteen hundred years ago.

In all this, which we have quoted from Mr Winslow's address, he assumes the lofty ground, that the religious man, religious in his sense of the word, is the only good citizen. We are no advocates of atheism, and yet we respect such a man, if he be benevolent and virtuous, as much as we respect a Christian.

We are not of the Orthodox sect, but we venerate one of that persuasion, if a good man; if intolerant and vicious, his religion will do him no good, in our opinion. We do not believe that "adversaries of accountability to God," are enemies to our republic—that they degenerate to a level with brute beasts, in their moral feelings, or that they lose any claim, either naturally, morally, or constitutionally, to the privileges of a free government. The intimation that they do, it seems to us, can only emanate from an empty head and an intolerant heart. By "adversaries to human accountability to God," Mr Winslow can only mean those who do not *believe* in future rewards and punishments, in the next world, for deeds done in the body. There can be no other meaning to his phrase. If he mean to confine this miserable ebullition of intolerant invective to those he calls atheists, let us see how much worse they are than those called the most orthodox, the true believers in the doctrine of election, eternal salvation, and eternal misery. The atheist believes in no God—in no future existence. It is said that he has hence no moral force to impel him to do right. But how is it with the elect? They believe that "the elect" never fall from grace—that God, from all eternity, doomed some to be saved and some to be lost. Each one supposes that he himself is of the favored number, and is only unhappy here, because some of his neighbors, of different belief may, by possibility, be saved also. A man, entertaining such a belief, can have no more fear of future punishments than he who believes in no future existence at all. So, too, with the Universalists, who believe in the salvation of *all* men, through the atoning and propitiating power of the SAVIOUR, they are as obnoxious as the atheist to the uncharitable and insolent charge of being enemies to the republic. These attacks upon a class of men, for a mere matter of belief, were they not the emanations of a besotted intellect, would be impious. There is neither merit in belief nor demerit in disbelief. Man must believe according to the laws by which God has ordained he shall believe; that is, according to the convictions which facts and arguments impress upon his mind. We are created with different reasoning powers, with different degrees of acuteness in our perceptions; therefore, what may appear very clearly to be true to one mind, may not appear so to another. One may suppose from the facts he knows and the reasons he has heard or conceives, that there is one self-existent intelligence; another may believe there are three, that these three are one, and this one is three; another, again, may believe that the laws of cohesion, gravitation, polarity, and so forth, are self-existent, and constitute the Deity; and each of these believers might be a very honest man. If their investigations, and the light which God has given them, have really lead to these beliefs in each, they cannot help it, and no act of volition on their part can change such a conviction. Such being our nature, constituted by God himself, how intolerant, nay, how IMPIOUS, to say, that *belief* degrades us to a level "of brute beasts." That, by a particular *belief* on the subject of a future state of existence, we "forfeit all claim to the privileges of a free government." What impious nonsense to be paid for from the public chest! You may punish men for illegal *acts*, but God alone is answerable for their *belief*.

Mr Winslow intimates that France, at one time, was atheistical, and that, consequently, she was more sanguinary. During the French revolution, the dominant Roman Catholic religion, which had long been the prop of the throne and the scourge of the people, fell with the expulsion of the royal family,

and some mummery of an infidel character was unsuccessfully attempted to be substituted. There is no evidence of any general prevalence of irreligion at that time among the people. The corruptions of a dominant church, and the oppressions of a debauched and lazy priesthood, had called forth the vengeance of an irritated people against *the* religion of a sect. If religious sentiments are parts of our nature, as Mr Winslow admits, does it appear very likely that atheism would universally or even extensively prevail? But even if it did, if atheism proved sanguinary—if it caused the executions and massacres of that bloody period, it lies not in the mouth of modern, practical, Christianity to reproach it. The whole number, executed and massacred during the reign of terror, we believe, has never been rated at over three hundred thousand, throughout all France, and probably was not a third of this number. We suppose Mr Winslow may have heard of St Bartholomew's day—it is noted in the annals of Christian France—it is the 24th of August, and on this day 1572—the Catholics, the then dominant sect, butchered, in three days in Paris, above ten thousand, lords, gentlemen, presidents, and people of all ranks, for not being Catholics like themselves. A horrid scene of things, says Thuanus, the historian, when the very streets and passages resounded with the noise of those that met together for murder and plunder; the groans of those who were dying and the shrieks of those who were going to be butchered, were every where heard —the bodies of the slain thrown out of the windows, the courts and chambers of the houses filled with them—the dead bodies of others dragged through the streets; their blood running in torrents through the channels into the Seine. An innumerable number of men, women with child, maidens and children, were all involved in one common destruction; and the gates of the King's palace were all besmeared with human gore. In the city of Maux, two hundred men were imprisoned, and after great numbers of females had been ravished and murdered, these two hundred were called, one by one, from the prison, and butchered as if they had been beasts; the murderers plundering, as well as slaying, their victims. One hundred thousand persons are estimated to have fallen in this massacre."

When the Pope of Rome heard that this butchery was executed by *order of the king*, Charles the 9th, of France, he marched to the church of St Mark, and in the most solemn manner, returned thanks to God for *so great a blessing conferred on the Christian world.* The Pope thought these heretics unworthy to enjoy the blessings of life; Mr Winslow, somewhat more mild, thinks *his* unbelievers, his heretics, only mere brute beasts, who, for their *opinions*, have forfeited all claims to the privileges of a free government.

Grotius informs us that one hundred thousand persons suffered by the hand of the executioner, in Belgium, for religious opinions, about the same period. Forty thousand persons were massacred in Ireland for religious opinions, beginning October 20, 1611, in the reign of Charles I.

It is said that the Spaniards, in the first forty years after the discovery of the New World, sacrificed FIFTEEN MILLIONS OF THE NATIVES to the genius of *practical* Christianity, as expounded by Popery. Whatever may have been the sanguinary character of "atheistical" France, "Christian" France offers a bloodier and a more atrocious page. But it was not Christianity, nor Atheism, that produced the bloodshed, in either case. It was fraud and intolerance—it was that spirit which brands a man as a "brute beast"—as forfeiting all claims to the privileges of a free government for an unimportant difference of opinion, for a mere matter of belief, over which no man has volition.

"Atheistical France" executed the wretches, who, not content to enjoy equal rights with other citizens, attempted to subvert the liberties which the people had just then regained.

Christian France massacred her victims, because they expressed an *opinion* which was impressed on their minds through the power of Omnipotence. Mr Winslow insults, abuses, and libels people for the like reasons, and our City Authorities pay for printing this intolerant trash, from the public purse.

We have no idea of permitting any man, who assumes the garb of *piety*, to claim, in consequence, any preëminence in *virtue*. We prize truth above all things, and it is quite time that we understood the ust distinction between virtue and religion.

We consider, then, that religion is not even presumptive evidence of virtue. Religion is a belief in a superintending Providence, who is propitiated by sacrifices and rites, who is swerved by prayer, and who yields to the supplications of the penitent. This belief is compatible, as all experience teaches, with great moral obliquity, in the same individual—or it may unite with great virtue in the same person. Religion, therefore, offers no proof of a good life; but it is evidence of great selfishness. The Creator has made self-interest the only rule of action in man—to say that a man acts without self-interest, is to say that he moves without a motive power. The broad, natural distinction, therefore, all men being equally selfish, between virtue and vice—that distinction which is founded in the nature of things, we take to be this—the virtuous man pursues his self-interest, his self gratification, so as never to invade the rights of others, and to administer as much to the happiness of his fellows as is in his power. The vitious man pursues his self-interest, his self-gratification, regardless of the rights and interests of his fellows.

If this definition be founded in natute, it follows that religion is not evidence of virtue. The religious man works for his reward, and, like the adventurous merchant, makes a long investment—he is willing to endure much here, for the benefit of the long and happy hereafter, which lies in prospect. Let us, then, take religious people as we find them—try them by their conduct towards mankind, and not by their belief, or their rites towards their God. If you find a kind, benevolent, just-dealing man, call him what he is—a virtuous, good citizen. If you see an intolerant, egotistical, vain, persecuting, man, though he beat the pulpit for a living and prays loud at conference meetings, class him among the vicious. It is his natural rank.

Mr Winslow says—

"Let them [the principles of moral accountability] be commissioned, as set forth and sanctioned in the Sacred Scriptures, to enlighten the understanding, invigorate the intellects, elevate the aim, inspire the hearts, and *control the wills* of both subject and magistrate."

Ay! but who is to say what is "set forth and sanctioned in the Sacred Scriptures?" who is to say in what *manner* they are to "control the wills of *subject* and *magistrate?*" Surely, it is Mr Winslow and those who believe as he believes. He has already denounced "the adversaries of human accountability to God," that is, those who do not *believe* as he be-

heves, as enemies to the republic, as "brute beasts," as having "forfeited all claims to the privileges of a free government." Give to him, or to any one else, the "commission" to decide what is set forth and sanctioned in the Sacred Scriptures, by which "to control the wills of subjects and magistrates," and we should have at once an hierarchy as odious as Popery. The Sacred Scriptures are before the people, each can read, and each will—aye, must—believe as he is convinced. This does not suit the Christian charity and self-complacency of Mr Winslow—a difference of opinion, no vicious act, no invasion of a fellow-being's right, a mere difference of belief, leads him to denounce his opponent as an enemy to the republic—a brute beast—as having forfeited all claims to the privileges of a free government. But who, let us ask, is really the most of a "brute beast," the author or the object of such a vile denunciation?

Mr Winslow continues, as follows:—

"The doctrine is becoming somewhat prevalent, and is incorporated in many of the most popular and imposing theories of our day, that all men have the same identical rights and liberties; that it is only needful to be a *human being* to possess all the qualities requisite for one to govern himself and others. If this is so, why is there any need of civil government? Indeed, what is government in any form, human or *divine*, but *usurpation?* [God a usurper?] * *

"Our excellent ancestors entertained no such views. Fathers and benefactors of human liberty, they neither acknowledged nor sought such liberty as this! That they were sometimes intolerant, we all admit. But there is an *apology* for them in the fact, that they considered they were making a momentous experiment for all succeeding generations, in which they had no hope of success but in the prevalence of what they considered sound moral and religious principles; that they had adventured every thing in this great enterprise; that they had the prior occupancy of the soil; and that if men wished to try an experiment of another kind, this great western world was before them, and they could go and secure a place for themselves. Whatever may be thought of some of the measures of the Puritans, the principles by which they were actuated, and the general course of their conduct, as well as the fruits of their labors, have rendered their names and their example worthy of everlasting remembrance and imitation."

Mr Winslow says, then, that the doctrine is becoming somewhat prevalent, that all men have the same identical rights and liberties, but that our excellent ancestors entertained no such views.

We had thought that this doctrine was long ago well established, recognised in the declaration of our National Independence, and incorporated into our State Constitution as the fundamental law of the Commonwealth. The Constitution says—

"*All men are born free and equal*, and have certain *natural*, essential and unalienable rights; among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; that of acquiring, possessing and protecting property; in fine, that of *seeking* and obtaining their safety and *happiness*." * *

"The end of the institution, maintenance and administration of government, (says the Constitution) is, to furnish the individuals who compose it (the body politic) with the power of enjoying in safety and tranquillity, their natural rights and the blessings of life," [as described above in the Constitution.]

We have no comment to offer on the impious suggestion, that the divine government, the government of God, is a usurpation; but in regard to Mr Winslow's other idea, that all human government is a usurpation, we oppose to it the declaration in the Constitution on the same subject, as follows:—

"The body politic is formed by the *voluntary* association of individuals; it is a social compact, by which the whole people covenants with each citizen, and each citizen with the whole people, that *all* shall be governed by certain laws for the *common good*."

Mr Winslow's idea, that government of all kinds is usurpation, finds, we thus see, no sanction in the Constitution, an instrument framed by our fathers, and recently amended and confirmed by our citizens.

But perhaps he intends to go back to the Puritans, the Pilgrims, for his model. Though descended from one of the passengers in the Mayflower, we have less respect for the motives of the Pilgrims, and less veneration for their conduct than Mr Winslow seems to entertain. Mr Winslow admits their intolerance, and offers what he calls an apology for it, but what seems to us, a justification of it. The apology we offer for their intolerance is an utter ignorance, on their part, of any correct notions of religious liberty or of toleration. A liberty to express their own belief and to repress the expression of all other, seems to have been the full extent of their ideas and knowledge of religious liberty.

Mr Winslow traces the great results of their settlement to their moral and religious virtues. We ascribe them to their free system of civil government, and this, it appears by the testimony of history, they adopted rather by accident and from the force of circumstances, than by reflection and design. Mr Morton, who published his Memorial in 1670, tells us that "he had *then* lately sure intelligence that the Dutch, intending to settle a colony to the southward of the Hudson, where the charter of the Pilgrims authorised them to go, privately hired the master of the ship [in which they embarked] to contrive delays in England, then to steer them to these northern coasts, and there, under pleas of shoals and winter, to discourage them from venturing farther." * *

"Being thus, beside their intention, brought to the New England coast, where their *patent* gave them *no right or power*, they were in a sort *reduced to a state of nature*; and some of the *strangers received* at London, *dropping some mutinous speeches, as if there were now no authority over them*; this people, *therefore*, before landing, *wisely formed themselves into a body politic*"—conditioned to be ruled by fixed laws, enacted by the majority.

It was this democratic principle, thus, as it seems, accidentally forced upon them, which laid the foundation of their succeeding improvements. They owe their prosperity more to their democracy, than to their theocracy.

The pilgrims, their associates, and their successors, appear to have been bigoted and intolerant. Their feeling and measures, however, in regard to religion, were the natural offspring of the darkness and ignorance of the age and of themselves.

Their transatlantic pastor, Mr Robinson, who did not come over with them, held to different and more liberal views than their's—views not only in advance of the opinions of his age, but of our day—worthy, however, of the most profound consideration of every good and liberal-minded man of every era of the world.

The historian says—

"Mr Robinson was always against separation from

any of the churches of Christ; holding communion with the reformed churches, both in Scotland, France, and the Netherlands; his study was for peace and union"

In our day, the study of each sect is more for supremacy than for union, often hating each other in all bitterness and uncharitableness.

In parting with his flock, Governor Winslow informs us, that Mr Robinson

"Charged us if God should reveal anything to us by any other instrument of his, to be as ready to receive it as ever we were to receive any *truth* from him; for he was confident that the Lord had *more truth and light* yet to break out of his holy word. He took occasion, also, miserably to bewail the state of the reformed churches, who were come to a period in religion, and would go *no further than the* INSTRUMENTS *of their reformation*. As, for example, the Lutherans could not be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; for whatever part of God's word He had further revealed to Calvin, they had *rather die* than embrace it; and so, said he, you see the Calvinists, *they stick where he left them; a misery much to be lamented*. For though they were precious shining lights *in their times*, yet God had *not revealed* his *whole* will to them. And were *they* now alive, said he, *they* would be as ready to embrace *further* light as that they had received. * * But withal, he exhorted us to take heed what we receive for TRUTH, and well to examine, compare and weigh it with the Scriptures, before we receive it. For, said he, *it is not possible that the Christian world should come so lately out of such anti-Christian darkness, and that full perfection of knowledge should break forth at once*, &c.—"words," says the ancient historian, "almost astonishing in that age of *low and universal bigotry which then prevailed in the English nation*; wherein this truly great and learned man seems to be *almost* the *only* divine who *was capable of rising into a noble freedom of thinking and practising in religious matters*, and even of urging such an equal liberty on his own people."

There can be no justification for the bigotry and intolerance of the Pilgrims, and no apology except their ignorance in common with that of their age, of any enlarged principles of religious liberty.

Mr Robinson, it will be seen from the foregoing account of him, sought to find TRUTH; the Pilgrims sought to maintain *conformity*. The same distinction still marks the characters of the opposing parties of the present day—the liberal and the illiberal. The liberal party seek for *truth*—they wish that our Christian community should exemplify in their lives the charity they profess on their lips—they demand that all citizens abide by the principles of the government they have adopted, until those principles are legally changed. The illiberals, on the other hand, assume all knowledge—to be themselves, instead of the Constitution, the standard of orthodoxy and excellence—and to denounce, as "brute beasts," those who differ from them in opinion—they demand acts of conformity, and scoff at the solemn constitutional compacts into which they have entered—they put to scorn all the charitable precepts, all the humility, of the religion they profess.

Let us, when we are scanning the character and history of the Pilgrims, look at them as they really were, an enterprising, selfish, opinionated, intolerant, society of religious people, whose theological views and systems retarded, rather than promoted, the increase of the colony, and the diffusion of freedom; and which thus, for a time, in some degree, defeated the purposes of society and the ordinance of scripture, to "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it."

Let us not, for the purpose of magnifying our own consequence and favoring illiberal systems, give to the character and conduct of the Pilgrims a gloss not sanctioned by history.

We should keep their example in remembrance, imitate their good deeds, but we desire no "imitation" of their religious intolerance.

Mr Winslow quotes from a London tory writer the following, page 14 of his oration :—

"The disruption of the United States from the mother country, and the outburst of the French revolution, were the first effects, on a large scale, of those principles, which, in America, had their birth in the love of liberty, but debased by their mixture with atheism and a spirit of anarchy, which had long been brooding on the continent, began to threaten the very foundations of social order."

Here is the old cant about infidelity and liberty, fresh from the tory fountain, shining black, with the smoke of London.

The French revolution, like the American, restored the principles of social order. The Americans first proclaimed the equality of human rights—they first asserted that one people had no right to bind another free people—that they themselves had a right to be governed by their own laws—and that, as all men had equal rights, those laws ought to be framed to promote the general good, under the sanction of the majority. France had groaned for ages under a despotism—for nearly two centuries no representative assembly had been convened—the wealth of the nation, earned by the labor of the people, had been engrossed by the privileged classes, the mere drones of society, who rioted in luxuries and wasted in debaucheries, that which had been earned by others. The people rose to recover their rights and their property. The conflict was long and sanguinary—villany, in his sacerdotal robes—injustice, in his ermine—the king, with his sceptre, all combined against the people—treachery, fraud, falsehood, assassination, all the vile engines which pride, avarice and power, throughout all Europe, could command, were brought to bear against the struggling people of France—struggling, not as Mr Winslow would make us believe, to sap the foundations of social order, but to restore them—to fix them on just principles, the will of the majority. The overthrow of a vicious priesthood is by no means the overthrow of religion. The overthrow of a privileged class is not the overthrow of social order. To award the achievement of the French revolution to the influence of atheism, is to give to atheism a merit to which it can lay no claim. The French revolution was a great and glorious step in the march of freedom—all was not achieved, we grant, that ought to have been realised, and that would have been realised but for foreign interference; and but for that, its history would not have been marked with those atrocities at which humanity may well weep. But these atrocities are chargable to the legitimates—to the party of privilege—to those who cling to the perpetuities of the old system—not to atheists, not to liberal men. Notwithstanding all this interference from abroad, the people broke down the privileges of classes, they regained the property of which they had been robbed, they recovered the rights of which they had been dispoiled, and inflicted a just, salutary, and signal vengeance on the usurpers, their oppressors. To the

legitimates, the French revolution offers a terrible example, an awful warning. Hence, in all Christendom, at all times, the bigoted and illiberal portion of mankind point to its bloody character, as if blood and anarchy were the necessary fruits of liberty. They denounce it as atheism, and endeavor to make atheism, bloodshed, anarchy, and injustice, synonymous with liberty and the French revolution. The finer sensibilities of our nature, our religious prejudices, everything is brought forth to distract the mind from the true merits of this question, and to make the principles of liberty odious by means of the French revolution. In this spirit, the tory Burke describes, in impassioned language, and with poetic license, the fall of the royal family of France, and Mr Winslow appends it to his oration, to be printed and circulated at the public charge.

"History (says Burke) will record, that on the morning of the 6th of October, 1789, the king and queen of France, after a day of confusion, alarm, dismay and slaughter, lay down, under the pledged security of public faith, to indulge nature in a few hours of respite, and troubled melancholy repose. From this sleep the queen was first startled by the voice of the sentinel at her door, who cried out to her to save herself by flight. * * This king, to say no more of him, and this queen, and their infant children, were then forced to abandon the sanctuary of the most splendid palace in the world, which they left swimming in blood, polluted by massacre, and strewed with scattered limbs and mutilated carcasses. Thence they were conducted into the capital of their kingdom. Two had been selected from the unprovoked, unresisted, promiscuous slaughter, which was made of the gentlemen of birth and family who composed the king's body guard. These two gentlemen, with all the parade of an execution of justice, were cruelly and publicly dragged to the block, and beheaded in the great court of the palace. Their heads were stuck upon spears, and led the procession, whilst the royal captives who followed in the train were slowly moved along, amid the horrid yells, and thrilling screams, and frantic dances, and infamous contumelies, and all the unutterable abominations of the furies of hell, in the abused shape of the vilest of women. * * It is now sixteen or seventeen years since I saw the queen of France, then the dauphiness, at Versailles; and surely never lighted on this orb, which she hardly seemed to touch, a more delightful vision I saw her just above the horizon, decorating and cheering the elevated sphere she just began to move in—glittering like the morning star; full of life, and splendor, and joy. Oh! what a revolution! and what an heart must I have, to contemplate without emotion that elevation and that fall! Little did I dream when she added titles of veneration to those of enthusiastic, distant, respectful love, that she should ever be obliged to carry the sharp antidote against disgrace concealed in that bosom; little did I dream that I should have lived to see such disasters fallen upon her in a nation of gallant men—in a nation of men of honor and of cavaliers. I thought ten thousand swords must have leaped from their scabbards to avenge even a look that threatened her with insult. But the age of chivalry is gone; *that of sophisters, economists, and calculators has succeeded; and the glory of Europe is extinguished for ever.* Never, never more, shall we behold that generous loyalty to rank and sex, that proud submission, that dignified obedience, that subordination of the heart, which kept alive, even in *servitude* itself, the spirit of an exalted freedom. The unbought grace of life, the cheap defence of nations, the nurse of manly sentiment and heroic enterprise is gone" * *

This is all very pretty declamation, and would have been very well for the time and place in which it was spoken, had it contained more truth and less fiction, and had it also traced the causes which led to the scenes it describes. But how misplaced at this time, and on this occasion. How unwise and unfair to hold it as proof of the incapacity of the people for self-government, to offer it as evidence in favour of a monarchical system. We have no desire to detract from the personal merits of Louis the Sixteenth, nor from the personal charms of his Queen. Those, however, ought to have, and could have, little influence in defining and fixing the political rights of a great people.

The tumult of the 6th of October, 1789, was brought upon Versailles by the indiscretion of the Queen and of the ladies of her court, and by the pride, folly, conspiracy, and treachery of the nobles who congregated at Versailles.

The National Assembly was arranging a constitution for France; it was laboring to establish, on a permanent foundation, a free and just government; and had the nobility and clergy been content with an equality of rights and privileges, with the rest of the nation, bloodshed would have been avoided, and France would have reposed in peace and liberty. But such was uncongenial to their feelings—adverse, as they thought, to their interests. They were preparing plans for civil war—they were contriving schemes for the dissolution of the National Assembly—they were forming a plot at Versailles to carry the King and Royal Family to Metz, to place him under the control, and to use him as the head, of the privilege party, in a furious war upon the people. These conspirators, confident in their own minds of success, became bold and insolent, they openly wore the cross of St. Louis in the streets of Paris, and at the palace of Versailles, where swarms of them gathered. Great efforts were made to conciliate and prepare the body guard, the regiment of Flanders, and seduce them to favour the outbreak. A splendid banquet was given to the officers of this regiment, on the first of October, at Versailles, in the Hall of Hercules, at which, during the drunken revelry, the King and Queen made their appearance—the tricolored cockade, the badge of the new order of things, was insulted—the officers and soldiers of the guard continued to wear the white cockade—the badge of Bourbons; the females of the court were busy in distributing among the troops and the conspirators these emblems of the opposing party. Everything indicated a speedy attempt at a counter revolution, under the sanction of the Queen, if not of the King. The people of Paris, who had then but just tasted of liberty, rushed to Versailles to nip this conspiracy in the bud, and rescue the King from the hands of the conspirators. If the nobility and the royal family had themselves acted in good faith, they might have reposed in safety under that of the people—they first broke their faith—they first attempted to wrest from the people their right of self government—they were plotting again to enslave France for their own aggrandizement, and because this handful of selfish, lazy, dishonest people, from the privileged classes, were checked in their projects of plunder, our sympathy is to be aroused, and appeals in the most thrilling eloquence are made, to persuade us that

monarchy, after all, is the only right form of government.

It is true, a mob assailed the palace, and entered it, and it is equally true that the National Guards of Paris, the troops of the people, under La Fayette, marched to the rescue, and saved the royal family. The Queen was not first aroused by a centinel at her door, but this is of no importance, except to show that Burke has adorned his eloquence by fiction. It is the same when he says that two bloody heads, of the massacred body guards, led the procession. He further says, the royal captives moved along in this train "amid the horrid yells, and thrilling screams, and frantic dances, and infamous contumelies, and all the *unutterable* abominations of the furies of hell, in the abused shape of the vilest of women." This may be to some extent true, or it may not be; but could Burke find no sympathy for these "vilest of women," as he calls them? Did it never occur to him that probably the very political system which had just been overturned, had degraded and brutified them—that they had been kept ignorant, the better to enslave them—that the royal family, who had so long held France in slavery—who had been faithless to the trust reposed in them—who had done nothing to elevate the character and equalize the rights of the people, over whom they ruled, were but reaping the harvest of their own sowing? Could we not have learned from history, that all public oppressions finally meet a signal punishment, however distant the day of retribution may be—that the wheel of fortune is sure to revolve, relieve the oppressed, and make the oppressor feel its weight? These vile women, as Burke decribes them, now so degraded, had they and their kindred been permitted to control their own industry, and enjoy the proceeds of their own honest labor—had the royal family but have secured to them this boon, as it was their duty to do—had their earnings not been filched to swell the useless splendor of the throne, and the vain pomp of the privileged classes, they perhaps might have moved in the bright paths of virtue, and adorned the halls of social enjoyment.

Burke's eloquent philanthropy was not broad and expansive enough to embrace this view; it was selfish, narrow, servile. Eloquence it may be, but it is eloquence pleading for injustice—for slavery—it is eloquence founded in falsehood and turned against humanity. How ignorant, how short-sighted, to suppose that the glory of Europe was ever extinguished by the French revolution. What a miserably degraded sentiment to suppose, that proud submission, dignified obedience, and loyalty to *rank* converts even *servitude* itself into the *spirit* of exalted *freedom*. Has the world lost, as Burke asserts, by loosing the "chivalry" of Bourbon France; has it not rather gained by the reign of "sophisters, economists, and calculators?" as Burke sneeringly describes the friends of liberty. How stand the arts, the sciences, learning, morals, the comfort, happiness, and well-being of the people now, compared with the age of "chivalry" so charming to the eye of Burke? Test his views, test his eloquence by these standards, and where shall we rank him? Surely among the short-sighted, selfish, slavish worshippers of royalty, among those who distrust the capacity and deny the right of the people to self-government; and yet he appears to be a model for many of our young political aspirants. Others may admire this speeimen of his eloquence, and of his principles, but it has no charms for us.

We are no advocates of the excesses and atrocities of the French revolution. We wish simply to explore the causes which produced them; trace them up to their source, and stamp the disgrace upon the real offenders. These offences were less the crimes of the French people, than of the tyrannical government—of the privileged class—that had for ages trampled down their most sacred rights, and driven the people themselves to desparation. Ground to the dust by the most odious tyranny and injustice, the people broke their chains over the heads of their oppressors, and gained their liberty before they were prepared to use it with judgment.

But it is not pity for human misery, it is not sympathy for men in distress, that calls forth the eloquence of legitimacy against bloodshed and anarchy. It is self-interest—not the *lives* that were lost—but the *systems* that were overthrown—the privileges destroyed—the monopolies broken up—rank levelled. The massacre of some 50,000 Janissaries, in Turkey, ten years since—the constant oppressions and butcheries of Ireland—the torrents of blood now being shed in the civil wars in Spain, arouse no sympathy—command no attention from the partizans of power; because in these bloody and ferocious conflicts privileges lose and liberty gains nothing. Place their noise, then, to the right account—to selfishness, and not to humanity; and let us bear in mind, that if the wrath of an enslaved and abused people is terrible, the cold-blooded cruelty of despotism is still more attrocious.*

Mr Winslow's idea of republican liberty and equality of rights is as follows—

"I conceive it to be summarily this, that all men have by nature the same right, and should have equal liberty to serve their maker with all their powers in the way most conducive to their own welfare, and that of their fellow beings. Under the control of the divine government there can be no clashing between a man's interest and that of his neighbor."

Mr Winslow informs us how a man is to serve his maker, viz: in a way most conducive to his own welfare, and to that of his neighbor. But who is to decide what is most conducive to one's own welfare, the man himself, or his neighbor? If my neighbor have the power to decide what is most fit for me to eat, to drink, to wear, and to do, there would be little liberty left to me. Mr Winslow thinks there would be little clashing of interests "under the control of the divine government. We do not know precisely what he means by the divine government. If he means a government of divines, in the worldly sense of the term, his views run counter to the testimony of all history; if by divine government, he mean any special order of Providence, something out of the course of nature, that being beyond the comprehension of mortals, we have no remarks to make upon it. If he mean that the divine will shall be expounded by religious teachers, then the will of a class becomes the law of the community. It seems, from

* Under the feudal system that prevailed in France before the revolution, the peasantry must attend the mill and the furnace of the Seignor when required—and under the term *corvee* they were compelled to devote a certain portion of their time, gratuitously, to the service of their Lord. The Seignor had also rights over the persons of newly married females, which M. Le Guen, in his speech before the National Assembly, said could not be named without offending the ears of modesty and humanity.

M La Poule, in the same debate, spoke of a feudal right, unused to be sure for centuries, but yet then still existing in some cantons of France, by which the Seignor was authorised on his return from the chase, to embowel two of his vassals, for the purpose of relaxing and warming his feet, by thrusting them into their warm and bloody carcasses.

It was such rights and privileges that produced the French revolution—it is such that have been destroyed by it.

this, as well as other passages in the oration, that Mr Winslow has no clear ideas in regard to republican liberty, or the equality of rights.

Mr Winslow's idea of religious liberty appears to be alike confused, as are his notions of republican liberty. He is quite oracular, but, we think, not quite sound.

"Religious liberty, (he says) allows the subject to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, *directed and controlled only by the teachings and authority of divine truth.*"

This is very like Mr Lothrop's and Judge Wilde's notions of religious liberty. Religious liberty, they say, is the liberty of being religious, and not of being irreligious, and they reserve to themselves the right of saying what is religion and what irreligion. And, so, too, we suppose Mr Winslow would claim the right to decide what were the teachings and authority of divine truth, that ought to direct and control the worship of God. In other words, his idea of religious liberty seems to be, to allow the "subject" to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, *provided* his conscience is directed and controlled by the teachings and authority of divine truth, *as expounded by Mr Winslow.*

The Constitution views religious liberty in quite a different light. It says—

"No subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to his own conscience, or for his religious professions and *sentiments; provided* he doth not disturb the public peace or obstruct others in their religious worship."

Mr Winslow was induced to offer this wise definition; wise above the Constitution, *because* "the times urgently demand that some CORRECT views of the rights and duties of republican citizens clearly defined, and set forth in a popular form, should be diffused through the nation."

"The nation," perhaps, if it ever hear of his profound exposition, may suitably reward him.

In speaking against what he terms the levelling system, (which is but a system of equality of rights,) and in favor of different ranks and conditions of society, Mr Winslow cites the case of the angels.

"It was (he says,) the levelling dispostion that cast down the shining angels from their starry heights. If it was evil in heaven, it is not less evil on earth."

We shall feel obliged to Mr Winslow for a little more information on this important case, thus cited as a precedent. Some few more facts and details seem necessary. We have not been able to find all we need on this point in the bible, perhaps we have not read it with sufficient care. Will Mr Winslow, who, being a divine, ought to possess the information, inform us, then, how many angels there are, how many different ranks, and what their order of precedence. What class attempted the levelling system. Who begun the rebellion, and what the cause. What time in biblical history they were created—for what purpose—what their powers—what their duties—what their form—what their appearance—what their substance, etherial or material—what their nature, immortal or mortal?

We can judge better whether their precedent, is as the lawyers say, a case in point or not, when we shall have been informed on these points. We trust the reverend gentleman will *think* of the points here named.

Mr Winslow courts popularity, by praising, without much tact, however, all classes of our citizens: the farmer, the mechanic, the man of the profession, the artizan, the merchant, manufacturer, &c, &c. He seems to be fishing for praise in pay, rather than to draw out truth. But even in this courting mood, he could not refrain from a tilt with Satan, in the garb of infidelity, though he had to pass his "friends," the mechanics, through the body with his drawn sword, to reach his foe.

"*Their* (the mechanics) *proverbial tendency to skepticism*, owing, in part, to their *dealing* exclusively *with cause and effect* in the material world—their opportunities of frequent intercourse with each other, and the reckless and revolutionary spirit, *engendered* by *infidelity, render them*, sometimes, *dangerous men to the republic.*"

So dealing with cause and effect, according to Mr Winslow, tends to skepticism; are we hence to infer the converse of this propositton, that religious faith best reposes in a disregard of cause and effect. We do not so understand religion. Does the opportunity of frequent intercourse with each other make mechanics more dangerous to the republic than other men? Do they, in fact, congregate more than professional men, merchants, &c. This fling at the mechanics, made at the expense both of religion and veracity, is the offspring of political rancour, rather than the child of fact. Mechanics, from the habit of dealing with "cause and effect," become close reasoners, and good judges of *truth*, hence we very generally find them ranged on the side of democracy, and HENCE their denunciation as dangerous members of society—that is, to the privileged classes, to the *monopolists* of business and wealth. It is not this intercourse, this combination, that is dangerous, but it is the democracy of the mechanics that is feared.

Mr Winslow calls upon the college-bred men—upon gentlemen, whose acquaintance, to use his latin phrase, was formed *inter sylvas academi*—men devoted to public life, and to the different learned professions, to cherish personal attachments, and an esprit du corps for their own benefit.

"Engaged (says he) in different departments of the same great work, they can do much (towards what?) towards *creating public confidence* in EACH OTHER." That is, he advises them to blow each others trumpets. The advice was needless.

In fulfilment, on his part, of this task, after abusing the mechanics as infidels, and dangerous men to the republic. He says—

"If any of our citizens deserve to be called working men, and public benefactors, those who faithfully sustain the civil offices, *and* the LEARNED PROFESSIONS, [and nearly all civil offices are filled from the learned professions,] of the land, are surely of that number. Most *people have no adequate conception of* the severity of their labors or the *value of their services.*"

If this be really so, then "most people have (in many cases) no adequate conception of the" extent of decimal-fraction calculations. Following up the idea against mechanics and men of humble condition, however good their minds and character, he endorses the following tory sentiment of some idol of his, viz:

"I do not hesitate to say that the road to eminence and power, from *obscure condition*, ought *not* to be made too easy, nor a thing too much of course."

Mr Winslow gives us the following remarks upon experiments—"*the* experiment"—we need not say

where he found his ideas on this subject, but here they are—

"Among the greatest evils in legislation, are those of *innovation* and *experiments*. The last place where an experiment should be made is at the head of a State or nation. Experiments should *always* be made on the smallest possible scale, that the risk may be as small as possible."

So we suppose Mr Winslow would either never have made the experiment of gaining our independence, or if commenced, he would first have begun with a town or parish.

So, too, with Luther's reformation, he would not, like Luther, have taken the bull by the horns, but would have plucked out a hair at a time.

We must once more contrast genius and dulness. Mr Forrest, speaking of the declaration of independence, says—

"That was the grandest, most important EXPERIMENT ever undertaken in the history of man. But they that entered upon it were not afraid of new experiments, if founded on the immutable principles of right, and approved by the sober convictions of reason. There were not wanting then, indeed, as there are not wanting now, pale counsellors to fear, who would have withheld them from the course they were pursuing, because it tended in a direction hitherto untrod. But they were not to be deterred by the shadowy doubts and timid suggestions of craven spirits, content to be lashed forever round the same circle of miserable expedients, perpetually trying anew the exploded shifts which had always proved lamentably inadequate before. To such men the very name of experiment is a sound of horror. It is a spell which conjurs up gorgons, hydras, and chimeras dire. They seem not to know that all that is valuable in life—that the acquisitions of learning, the discoveries in science, and the refinements of art, are the result of experiment. It was experiment that bestowed on CADMUS those keys of knowledge with which we unlock the treasure houses of immortal mind. It was experiment that taught BACON the futility of the Grecian philosophy, and led him to the heaven-scaling method of investigation and analysis on which science has safely climbed to the proud eminence where she now sits, despensing her blessings on mankind. It was experiment that lifted NEWTON above the clouds and darkness of this diurnal sphere, enabling him to explore the sublime mechanism of the stars, and weigh the planets in their eternal rounds. It was *experiment* that nerved the hand of FRANKLIN to snatch the thunder from the armory of heaven. It was EXPERIMENT that gave this hemisphere to the world. It was EXPERIMENT that gave this country FREEDON.

"Let us not be afraid to try experiments, merely because they are new, nor lavish upon aged error the veneration due only to TRUTH. Let us not be afraid to follow REASON, however far she may diverge from the beaten path of opinion. All the inventions which embellish life—all the discoveries which enlarge the field of human happiness, are but various results of the bold experimental exercise of that distinguished attribute of man."

Mr Winslow asks:

"And who are the men next to the profound and experienced statesmen, first to know, assuredly, whether legislation is right or wrong? Are they not those whose eyes and hands are actually upon the great springs and wheels which move the enterprise of the nation? Such men are the men who have the direction of our commercial and manufacturing operations. When *they* begin to see the signs of untoward causes in the doings of government, then let all the citizens be assured that evil is approaching, and, as they love their country, and *themselves*, hasten to avert it by a prompt action at the polls. And as to monopolies, of business and wealth, what of them?"

These sentiments Mr Winslow has minced up and warmed over from Mr Webster's speeches; and in another place he mouths over the epithets Burke applied to the liberal party, and like him avers, that "the brief and troubled night of sophisters and experimenters will pass away."

We feel obliged, however, to Mr Winslow for this *rechauffé* of great men's speeches, being infinitely superior to any of his *original* dishes.

So, next to Daniel Webster, the profound and experienced statesman, the merchants and manufactures are the *first* to know, that is, they are the *second* to know, whether legislation is right or wrong. They have "their eyes and hands upon the great springs and wheels which move the enterprise of the nation." And as to their "monopolies of business and wealth, what of them?" Daniel Webster says they are all right, and hence Mr Winslow believes them to be so, and he begs leave to refer the reader to the argument of Mr Webster in his "second speech on the Sub-Treasury bill," * * Wherein * * he "*demonstrates*," that instead of having anything to fear from monopolies of busiaess and wealth; all our citizens who are true to their own welfare will sustain the great interests of commerce, trade, and manufactures;" [by monopolies.]

Mr Webster is a very fortunate logician, to be able to "demonstrate" all this. But the great difficulty with Mr Webster is, that he supposes the interest of all to be the same as his own. He has been, and now is, the advocate and attorney of these monopolizers of "business and wealth." He has changed his principles of political economy, (but not his habits of personal economy,) as the varying interests of these classes required. He might well say, what Mr Winslow repeats, "as for monopolies of business and wealth, what of them? Do they not enable these men to pay me better fees—to make me, through their banks, heavier loans, to raise for me among their clamerous number *larger contributions?*"

The people do not think as well of these monopolies.

The "great springs and wheels which move the enterprise of the nation," we had supposed were the intelligence and labor of the producing classes; and the great mass of the producing classes is to be found among the farmers and mechanics. The monopolists have their "eyes and their hands" upon these, it is true, and they know whether legislation is "right or wrong;" that is, whether it will or will not enable the monopolists to engross the business of the country, and acquire the wealth labor has earned. Legislation, in this country, has been prostituted to the purposes of private gain, to that of monopolies of business and wealth. One class has been plundered to pamper another—the many have been made tributary to the few—agriculture, the mother of all industry—that support of life—that great interest, the source and foundation of all others, has been made to yield its constant and unequal tribute to the banker, the merchant, the manufacturer. In defiance of all the true principles of political economy, in violation of every rule of right, all other interests have been fostered at the expense of agriculture. Injudicious legislation, unwisely appropriating wealth, has

filled to overflowing the learned professions, leaving half their number useless drones upon society, or making them noisy office-seeking demagogues. It has inflated the credit system, by the artificial means of bank charters, monopolies for selling credit. It has profusely wasted capital, by calling it from profitable to unprofitable investments, from productive agriculture to unproductive manufactures, prematurely established; and has taxed agriculture, by means of imposts and prohibitory duties, to make up the loss. It has drawn capital and talent from the all-important pursuit of raising subsistence, until, but for foreign supplies, the country would have been on the brink of starvation. These results have been realised from "the monopolies of wealth and business," conferred by vicious legislation. Yet Mr Winslow asks, "what of them?" and declares, very coolly, that

"The cry of monopolies is the most unmeaning sound, with which envious indolence and disappointed ambition, in the haggard forms of paltroons and demagogues, ever deceived a people."

Mr Webster, we believe, has pretty much the same ideas in his "second speech on the Sub-Treasury Bill," and Mr Winslow seems willing to endorse them.

But we must part with Mr Winslow. We should not have kept him company so long, had not the City Authorities become his endorser. We would not, however, willingly part his debtor—we have profited so much from his opinions and advice, that we are willing to pay him with a little of our own. Knowing him only through the medium of this discourse, we have none but the most kindly personal feelings towards him. His intentions we have no doubt are good, but his head is filled with crudities and errors. His profession is meek and humble, but his spirit appears proud and domineering. He professes to be liberal, but makes war upon his own precepts. Time, investigation, reflection, and experience may correct these faults. Our advice, then, to him is, to stick to his sermons and let party politics alone—strive to bring back Christianity to its original simplicity, and give to it again its primeval lustre; make it, in practice, what it is in theory and in truth, meek, humble, charitable—a religion of allurment, not of terrors and menace. Let him keep in mind that acts, not opinions, define the character of an individual—that man is not responsible for the belief that facts impress upon his mind, to any being, except to the Deity himself—that for one man or the body politic to attempt to repress, by punishment or by censure in any form, the expression of belief on speculative questions, is both sinful and silly. Let him curb that personal vanity, which in the wicked people and pharisees of old, induced them to say, scornfully—"Stand by thyself, come not near to *me*, for *I* am holier than thou." Let him remember the quaint axiom, embodying the wisdom and experience of the whole community for ages, that "what is one man's meat is another's poison"—bear in mind that there may be great difference of opinion without much difference of morals. Be content in the enjoyment of his own opinion, without attempting to control the expression of his neighbor's. Be satisfied with his own virtue and religion, and cease all attempts to *compel* others to adopt his standard. Do all the good he can to himself and others, but never invade the rights and interest of his fellow; finally, attend to his own business, and leave his fellow men to their's, and we doubt not he will be happier and wiser than he is now.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 782 707 0

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 782 707 0

Permalife
pH 8.5